arXiv:1605.03698v1 [math.AP] 12 May 2016

A NOTE ON CONSTRUCTING SHARP EXAMPLES FOR L^p NORMS OF EIGENFUNCTIONS AND QUASIMODES NEAR SUBMANIFOLDS

MELISSA TACY

Abstract. In this note we produce a family flat model quasimode examples that can be used to determine sharpness of estimates on Laplacian eigenfunctions restricted to subsets. For each quasimode in the family we show that there is a corresponding spherical harmonic that displays the same growth properties. Therefore it is enough to check estimates against the simple flat model examples. Finally we present a heuristic that for any subset determines which quasimode in the family is expected to produce sharp examples and demonstrate the technique for restriction to shrinking neighbourhoods of submanifolds.

Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold and $\Delta = \Delta_g$ be the (positive) Laplace-Beltrami operator defined by the metric. There has been much recent interest (for example [1],[3] ,[5], [7], [10],[9],[11]) in understanding how the L^p norms of Laplacian eigenfunctions

$$\Delta u = \lambda^2 u$$

grow for large λ. In particular in comparing the L^p estimates over the full manifold with that on subsets. We seek estimates of the form

$$\|u\|_{L^p(X)} \lesssim \lambda^{\delta(n,p,X)} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}$$

where X is a subset of M (not necessarily of full dimension). Is is often instructive to translate to a semiclassical problem where $\lambda^{-1} = h$ and u is a solution to the semiclassical equation $(h^2\Delta - 1)u$. In fact it is more usual to consider approximate solutions, that is u such that

$$\|(h\Delta - 1)u\|_{L^2(M)} \lesssim h \|u\|_{L^2(M)} .$$

In this note we do not prove any new estimates, simply combine those already known to obtain L^p estimates near submanifolds. From such "cheap" arguments we are able to obtain almost all the estimates of [8] (there is some logarithmic loss on one estimate). The main point of this note is however to describe how to construct families of examples to examine questions of sharpness both for the flat model cases and for spherical harmonics. The spherical harmonic examples have the advantage of being exact eigenfunctions however they are not so easy to write down explicitly. The flat model examples are in contrast very easy to explicitly produce. The flat model also has the advantage that for any given p (with knowledge of the semiclassical version of the L^p estimate proof) it is easy to determine which functions in the family will give rise to sharp examples. We will show that every flat model example has a matching spherical harmonic which shares all relevant features. Therefore any result that is sharp under the flat model is sharp under

spherical harmonics. Finally we discuss given any particular p how one predicts which example will give rise to sharp estimates.

The whole and submanifold estimates are as follows

$$\|u\|_{L^2(X)} \lesssim h^{-\delta(n,k,p)} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}$$

for X a k dimensional smooth submanifold if $k < n$ and for $X = M$ if $k = n$. The function $\delta(n,k,p)$ is given by

$$\delta(n,n,p) = \begin{cases} \frac{n-1}{2} + \frac{n}{p} & \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1} \leq p \leq \infty \\ \frac{n-1}{4} + \frac{n-1}{2p} & 2 \leq p \leq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1} \end{cases}$$

$$\delta(n,n-1,p) = \begin{cases} \frac{n-1}{2} + \frac{n-1}{p} & \frac{2n}{n-1} \leq p \leq \infty \\ \frac{n-1}{4} + \frac{n-2}{2p} & 2 \leq p \leq \frac{2n}{n-1} \end{cases}$$

and for $k \leq n-2$

$$\delta(n,k,p) = \frac{n-1}{2} + \frac{k}{p} \quad 2 < p < \infty.$$

In the case $k \leq n-3$ or $n = 3, k = 2$ the $p = 2$ estimate is included, otherwise there is a logarithmic loss

$$\|u\|_{L^2(X)} \lesssim h^{-\frac{n-1+k}{2}} \log|h| \, \|u\|_{L^2}.$$

These estimates are due to

- Sogge [10] for L^p estimates over the full manifold and Koch-Tataru-Zworski [7] for the semiclassical problem.
- Burq-Gérard-Tzevtkov [1] for L^p estimates of eigenfunctions on submanifolds and Tacy [11] for the semiclassical problem.
- Chen-Sogge [3] for the endpoint estimate $(n,k,p) = (3,2,2)$.

It is well known that these estimates are saturated for high p by the zonal harmonics and for low p by the highest weight harmonics. The key features that saturate the estimates are a point concentration and a tube concentration. Zonal harmonics have a point concentration at their north pole while highest weight harmonics are highly concentrated in a $h^{\frac{1}{2}}$ width tube around a great circle.



FIGURE 1. Concentration at a point

For Σ a smooth k dimensional submanifold of M let Σ_β be the set

$$\Sigma_\beta = \{x \in M \mid d(x,\Sigma) \leq h^\beta\}$$



FIGURE 2. Concentration in a tube

where d is the usual distance associated with the metric g. We want an estimate of the form

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Sigma_\beta)} \lesssim h^{-\sigma(n,k,p,\beta)} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}$$

for u an Laplacian eigenfunction or of quasimode of $h^2\Delta_g - 1$. We make first some observations which will enable us to determine $\sigma(n,k,p,\beta)$ in many cases.

Observation 1 Clearly the L^p norm of u on Σ_β must be bounded by the L^p norm of u on M. Therefore for all p we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Sigma_\beta)} \lesssim h^{-\delta(n,n,p)} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}\,. \tag{1}$$

The question is then whether this can be improved. We must therefore first ask whether the known point and tube features fit inside Σ_β. If they do we can expect no better estimates that (1).

Observation 2 Since both the tube and point features can be placed inside Σ_β where $\beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ we know immediately that there can be no better estimates in this case.

Observation 3 Writing $x \in M$ as $x = (y,z)$ where $\Sigma = \{(y,z) \in M \mid z = 0\}$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Sigma_\beta} |u|^p dx &\leq \sup_{|z|\leq ch^\beta} \int |u|^p dy \times \int_{|y|\leq ch^\beta} dz \\ &\lesssim h^{-p\delta(n,k,p)} h^{\beta(n-k)}.\end{aligned}$$

So we may also say that

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Sigma_\beta)} \lesssim h^{-\delta(n,k,p)+\frac{\beta(n-k)}{p}} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}\,. \tag{2}$$

If for all $|z| \leq h^\beta$ the submanifold estimate is sharp we cannot expect to do better than (2).

Observation 4 Eigenfunctions and quasimodes have the property that they oscillate with frequency on the order h^{-1}, therefore the cannot change much in a region of size h. This means that the estimate of (2) is the best we may expect for $\beta \geq 1$ and in fact we see that this is indeed the cases for both the point and tube sharp examples.

From these four observations (along with interpolation from known results) we can generate a full set of L^p estimates that agree with [8] up to some logarithmic loss in some cases. In Section 2 we construct sharp quasimodes examples in the flat model case that prove these L^p estimates to be sharp. In Section 3 we show that on the sphere we can construct exact eigenfunctions with the same properties as the sharp quasimode examples which means that, in any situation, we may check estimates against the flat model. In Section 4 we discuss how, given knowledge of the

semiclassical techniques employed to prove the whole and submanifold estimates, one chooses the correct example to get a sharp quasimode.

1. L^p estimates on Σ_β

In this section we use our four observations along with known results to prove a full range of L^p estimates for Σ_β. Taken together Observations 2 and 4 tell us that there are no non-trivial estimates outside $\frac{1}{2} \leq \beta \leq 1$ so we focus on this region. We need to break into two cases, that where Σ is a hypersurface and that where it is a lower dimensional submanifold.

1.1. **Hypersurfaces.**

From Observation 1 we know that u must obey the full manifold estimates. Since $\beta > 1$ we may always fit the point type example into Σ_β so we cannot expect better estimates than those arising from a point concentration. So we know that

$$\sigma(n, n-1, p, \beta) = \delta(n, n, p) \quad p \geq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$$

and in this range these estimates are sharp. The sharp example for the low p hypersurface estimates is the tube oriented with its long direction along the hypersurface. Since this examples has relatively constant size in a $1 \times h^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ region the estimates of Observation 3 are the best we could expect. That is

$$\sigma(n, n-1, p, \beta) = \delta(n, n-1, p) - \frac{\beta}{p} \quad 2 \leq p \leq \frac{2n}{n-1}$$

and the tube example will give rise to sharp estimates. Therefore the only unknown estimates are those between $\frac{2n}{n-1}$ and $\frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$. We interpolate between them to obtain

$$\sigma(n, n-1, p, \beta) = \begin{cases} \delta(n, n, p) & p \geq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1} \\ \frac{\beta(n-1)}{2} - \frac{\beta(n+1)}{p} + \frac{1}{p} & \frac{2n}{n-1} \leq p \leq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1} \\ \delta(n, n-1, p) - \frac{\beta}{p} & 2 \leq p \leq \frac{2n}{n-1} \end{cases}$$

These are the same estimates as [8] except in the case $p = \frac{2n}{n-1}$ where these are logrithmically better. Since Observations 1 and 3 (along with the known sharp examples for manifolds and hypersurfaces) tell us that we have sharp examples for $p \geq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ and $p \leq \frac{2n}{n-1}$ the only question remaining is whether the intermediate bounds obtained through interpolation are sharp. In Section 2 we will construct model quasimodes that demonstrate sharpness. The results of Section 3 guarantee that there are exact eigenfunctions on the sphere that are also sharp.

1.2. **Lower dimensional submanifolds.**

Again Observation 1 tells us that

$$\sigma(n, k, p, \beta) = \delta(n, n, p) \quad p \geq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$$

The sharp submanifold restriction examples however are the point type eigenfunctions. Since this feature only persists for an $O(h)$ region we cannot expect to get sharp examples for low p from Observation 3. However Burq and Zuily [2] have, in the case $k \leq n-3$, obtained

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Sigma_\beta)} \lesssim h^{\beta - \frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_{L^2(M)}$$

so we may interpolate from this point to obtain

$$\sigma(n,k,p,\beta) = \begin{cases} \delta(n,n,p) & p \geq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1} \\ \frac{\beta(n-1)}{2} - \frac{\beta(n-1)}{p} + \frac{1}{p} & 2 \leq p \leq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1} \end{cases}$$

which give the same estimate as [8]. For the case $k = n-2$ the same result holds with a log loss.

We know that the high p estimates are sharp. In Sections 2 and 3 we show that the low p estimates (modulo the log loss) are also sharp.

2. Flat model examples

We study the flat model, that is, localised quasimodes of the Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^n$, to gain insight into sharp examples. Such quasimodes can be produced on the Fourier side easily. In keeping with the semiclassical theme we use the re-scaled semiclassical Fourier transform,

$$\mathcal{F}_h[u](\xi) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{i}{h}\langle x,\xi\rangle} u(x)\, dx.$$

This operator has the property that

$$\mathcal{F}_h\left[hD_{x_i}\right] = \xi_i \mathcal{F}_h[u]$$

and

$$\left\|\mathcal{F}_h[u]\right\|_{L^2} = \|u\|_{L^2}.$$

The development of flat model examples was discussed in [4]. We include it here for the readers convenience.

Suppose that u is an L^2 normalised $O_{L^2}(h)$ quasimode of $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n}$. We must have

$$\left\|(|\xi|^2 - 1)\mathcal{F}_h[u]\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim h,$$

Thus $\mathcal{F}_h[u]$ must be located near the sphere of radius 1 in the ξ-variables. We create a family of quaismodes indexed by α which controls the degree of angular dispersion of ξ. Write $\xi = (r,\omega)$ where $\omega \in S^{n-1}$ and set the coordinate system so that ω_0 corresponds with the unit vector in the ξ_1 direction. Let

$$\chi^h_\alpha(r,\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |r-1| < h, |\omega - \omega_0| < h^\alpha, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then set

$$f^h_\alpha(\xi) = f^h_\alpha(r,\omega) = h^{-1/2-\alpha(n-1)/2}\chi(r,\omega).$$

Note that f^h_α is L^2 normalised. Now set

$$T^h_\alpha(x) = \mathcal{F}_h^{-1}[f^h_\alpha](x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\frac{i}{h}\langle x,\xi\rangle} f_\alpha(\xi)\, d\xi.$$

T^h_α is an L^2 normalised $O(h)$ quasimode of $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n}$. We may write

$$T^h_\alpha(x) = \frac{h^{-1/2-\alpha(n-1)/2-n/2} e^{\frac{i}{h}x_1}}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{\frac{i}{h}(x_1(\xi_1-1)+\langle x,\xi'\rangle)} \chi_\alpha(\xi)\, d\xi.$$

Note that if $|x_1| < \epsilon h^{1-2\alpha}$ and $|x'| < \epsilon h^{1-\alpha}$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, the factor

$$e^{\frac{i}{h}(x_1(\xi_1-1)+\langle x',\xi'\rangle)}$$

does not oscillate so in this region

$$|T^h_\alpha(x)| > ch^{-(n-1)/2+\alpha(n-1)/2}.$$

We claim that when $\alpha = 1 - \beta$ the function T_α saturates the L^p estimates for Σ_β



FIGURE 3. T_α^h is localised so that is large in a $h^{1-2\alpha} \times (h^{1-\alpha})^{n-1}$ tube

in the case where Σ is a hypersurface and $\frac{2n}{n-1} \leq p \leq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ as well as the case where Σ is a lower dimensional submanifold and $p \leq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$.

Example 2.1. *We choose coordinates such that when we write $x \in M$ as $x = (y, z)$, $\Sigma = \{(y, z) \in M \mid z = 0\}$. By setting $\alpha = 1 - \beta$ we produce a function that has a $h^{2\beta-1} \times h^\beta$ tube where*

$$|T_{1-\beta}| \geq ch^{-\frac{\beta(n-1)}{2}}$$

Rotations and translations of T_α are still quasimodes so we may align it so that the long direction lies in the submanifold. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\alpha\|_{L^p(\Sigma_\beta)} &> ch^{-\frac{\beta(n-1)}{2}} h^{\frac{\beta(n-1)}{p} + \frac{2\beta-1}{p}} \\ &= ch^{-\frac{\beta(n-1)}{2} + \frac{\beta(n+1)}{p} - \frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

as required.

One could obtain this example by calculating lower bounds for the L^p norm for every α and then maximising. However by understanding the heuristics of the semiclassical proof one can immediately select the correct scale to find sharp examples in any situation. We discuss this heuristic in Section 4.

3. From quasimodes to exact eigenfunction

While they are easy to work with the quasimodes T_α only show us that estimates are sharp for quasimodes of the flat Laplacian. However we may construct exact L^2 normalised eigenfunctions on the sphere ϕ_α that have all the necessary properties of T_α. That is they have a $h^{1-2\alpha} \times h^{(1-\alpha)(n-1)}$ region where $|\phi_\alpha| \geq ch^{-\frac{n-1}{2} + \frac{\alpha(n-1)}{2}}$. Since this is the only property of T_α used to prove sharp examples this construction shows that any sharp examples from T_α give rise to sharp examples of exact eigenfunctions on the sphere.

To understand which spherical harmonics to pick we first re-express T_α as a sum of quasimodes, each of which has a well localised Fourier transform. Recall that T_α

has its semiclassical Fourier transform located in the h thick annulus about $|\xi| = 1$. Due to the curvature of this set we can localise around any given ξ in an $h \times h^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ box. This is the localisation scale of $T_{1/2}$ and a quasimodes localised on this scale about a fixed ξ is simply the standard $T_{1/2}$ quasimode rotated so that the long axis lies along ξ. We re-write $f^h_\alpha(\xi)$ as a sum of such functions each supported near some ξ_i, it is necessary to use $h^{(\alpha-\frac{1}{2})(n-1)}$ functions to cover the support of $f^h_\alpha(\xi)$. Therefore T_α can be though of as a sum of $h^{(\alpha-\frac{1}{2})(n-1)}$ functions each of which is a rotation of $T_{1/2}$.

The flat Laplacian quasimodes $T_{1/2}$ resemble the tubular concentrations we see in highest weight spherical harmonics. This leads us to the idea that we can create suitable a ϕ_α by considering a sum of rotated highest weight spherical harmonics. We write S^n as the subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ where $|x| = 1$, it is well known that the function

$$u(x) = j^{\frac{n-1}{4}}(ix_1 + x_2)^j$$

is a solution to the spherical Laplacian eigenfunction equation with $j(j+n-1) = \lambda^2 = h^{-2}$. Further if $x = (x_1, x_2, \bar{x})$ then

$$|u(x)|^2 = j^{\frac{n-1}{4}}(1 - |x'|^2)^j = j^{\frac{n-1}{4}} e^{j\log(1-|\bar{x}|^2)}$$

so $u(x)$ is highly concentrated on the equation $\bar{x} = 0$ with exponential decay when $|\bar{x}| \gg h^{1/2}$. The pre-factor of $j^{\frac{n-1}{4}} = h^{-\frac{n-1}{4}}$ ensures that $\|u\|_{L^2} \approx 1$. We produce an example by summing rotations of $u(x)$. In fact is is easiest to work inductively

Proposition 3.1. *For $1 \le k \le n$ and $h^{-2} = j(j+n-1)$ there exists a function u_k such that $\Delta_{S^n} u_k = j(j+n-1)u$ with the following properties,*

$$u_k(x) = h^{-\frac{n-1}{4} + \frac{(1/2-\alpha)(k-1)}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{N_k} (ix_1 + P_{l,k}(x_2, \dots, x_{k+1}))^j \tag{3}$$

where for some small but fixed ϵ, $N_k = \epsilon h^{(\alpha-1/2)(k-1)}$ and $P_{l,k}$ are linear polynomials whose coefficients $\alpha^m_{k,l}$ obey

1. $|1 - \alpha^2_{k,l}| \le \epsilon h^{2\alpha}$
2. $|\alpha^m_{k,l}| \le \epsilon h^\alpha \quad m \ne 2$

Further for any function of form

$$v^{\tilde{j}}_k(x) = h^{-\frac{n-1}{4} + \frac{(1/2-\alpha)(k-1)}{2}} \sum_{l=1}^{N_k} (ix_1 + P_{l,k}(x_2, \dots, x_{k+1}))^{\tilde{j}} f_{k,l}(x) \tag{4}$$

with N_k, $P_{l,k}$ as before and

1. *for a suitably large K, $|\tilde{j} - j| \le K$,*
2. *f a smooth function on S^n, $|f| > c > 0$ and*
3. *$|D^\alpha f| \le h^{-|\gamma|/2}$*

there exist constants c_1 and c_2

$$c_1 \le \left\|(1 + h(x^2_{k+2} + \cdots x^2_{n+1}))^{\beta_k} v_k\right\|_{L^2(S^n)} \le c_2. \quad k < n, 2\beta_k + 2 \le \beta_{k-1} \tag{5}$$

$$c_1 \le \|v_n\|_{L^2(S^n)} \le c_2. \tag{6}$$

Proof. The base case $k = 1$ is easy, in this case set

$$u_1(x) = h^{-\frac{n-1}{4}}(ix_1 + x_2)^j.$$

The only thing to check is that writing $x = (x_1, x_2, \bar{x})$

$$c_1 \leq h^{-\frac{n-1}{4}} \left\|(1 + h|\bar{x}|^2)^{n-1}(ix_1 + x_2)^j\right\|_{L^2(S^n)} \leq c_2.$$

This is just a direct property of the exponential decay away from the equator. We have

$$|(ix_1 + x_2)^j(1 + h|\bar{x}|^2)^{n-1}|^2 \leq (x_1^2 + x_2^2)^j(1 + h|\bar{x}|^2)^{2(n-1)}$$

so

$$h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \int_{S^n} |(ix_1+x_2)^j(1+h|\bar{x}|^2)^{n-1}|^2 d\mu(x) \leq h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} \int e^{j\log(1-|\bar{x}|^2)}(1+h|\bar{x}|^2)^{2(n-1)} d\mu(x)$$

however away from a $h^{1/2}$ region around the equator $\bar{x} = 0$ the exponential decay more than compensates for the polynomial growth. Now assuming the inductive hypothesis for $k - 1$ note that if R is a rotation of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and u_{k-1} is a Laplacian eigenfunction on the sphere $u_{k-1} \circ R$ is also a Laplacian eigenfunction. Define the following rotations $R_{s,k}$ by

$$(R_{s,k}(x))_2 = \sqrt{1 - hs^2}x_2 + h^{1/2}sx_{k+1}$$
$$(R_{s,k}(x))_{k+1} = -h^{1/2}sx_2 + \sqrt{1 - hs^2}x_{k+1}$$
$$(R_{s,k}(x))_m = x_m \quad m \neq 2, k + 1$$

for $s = 1, \ldots, \epsilon h^{\alpha-1/2}$ (where ϵ is some small but fixed number). Then let

$$u_k = h^{\frac{(1/2-\alpha)}{2}} \sum_{s=1}^{\epsilon h^{\alpha-1/2}} u_{k-1} \circ R_s(x).$$

Clearly u is an eigenfunction and can be expanded as a sum of N_k terms. Now

$$P_{l,k-1} \circ R_s(x) = P_{l,k}(\sqrt{1 - hs^2}x_2 + h^{1/2}sx_{k+1}, \ldots, x_k)$$

so $P_{l,k-1} \circ R_s$ can be written as linear polynomial in $x_2, \ldots x_{k+1}$ whose coefficients $\alpha^m_{k-1,l,s}$ obey

$$|1 - \alpha^2_{k-1,l,s}| = |1 - \alpha^2_{k-1,l}\sqrt{1 - hs^2}| \leq h^{2\alpha}$$

and

$$|\alpha^{k+1}_{k-1,l,s}| \leq |\alpha^2_{k,l}|h^{1/2}s \leq h^\alpha$$

all other coefficient estimates follow directly from the inductive assumption. So it only remains to prove the L^2 bounds. We will use an almost orthogonality argument with the induction and show that for any f with $|D^\gamma f| \leq h^{-|\gamma|/2}$

$$\left|\int_{S^n} v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1} \circ R_{s,k}(x) v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1} \circ R_{s',k}(x) f(x)(1 + h(x^2_{k+2} + \cdots x_{n+1}))^{2\beta_k} d\mu(x)\right| \leq (1 - |s - s|)^{-2} \tag{7}$$

which implies (after possibly taking a subset of s) (5) or (6). A change of variables $x \to R^{-1}_{s',k}(x)$ reduces (7) to

$$\left|\int_{S^n} v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1} \circ R_{s,k} \circ R^{-1}_{s',k}(x) v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}(x) \tilde{f}(x)(1 + h(x^2_{k+2} + \cdots x^2_{n+1})^{2\beta_k} d\mu(x)\right| \leq (1 - |s - s|)^{-2}. \tag{8}$$

We have

$$(9)\quad (R_{s,k}\circ R^{-1}_{s',k}(x))_2 = (\sqrt{(1-hs^2)(1-hs'^2)}+hss')x_2 + (h^{1/2}s\sqrt{1-hs'^2}-h^{1/2}s'\sqrt{1-hs})x_{k+1}.$$

We will work in angular coordinates and use (9) to get an integration by parts identity. Let $\phi_1,\dots,\phi_n$ be coordinates so that $\phi_1\in[0,2\pi]$ and the other $\phi_m\in[0,\pi]$. Then we have the conversion formulae

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+1} &= \cos(\phi_n)\\ x_n &= \sin(\phi_n)\cos(\phi_{n-1})\\ x_{n-1} &= \sin(\phi_n)\sin(\phi_{n-1})\cos(\phi_{n-2})\\ &\vdots\\ x_2 &= \sin(\phi_n)\cdots\sin(\phi_2)\cos(\phi_1)\\ x_1 &= \sin(\phi_n)\cdots\sin(\phi_2)\sin(\phi_1). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the individual terms in the sum

$$(10)\quad \frac{d}{d\phi_{k+1}}[v^{\tilde{j}+1}_{k-1}\circ R_{s,k}\circ R^{-1}_{s',k}] = (\tilde{j}+1)[v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}\circ R_{s,k}\circ R^{-1}_{s',k}]$$
$$\times\Big(F(\phi_n,\dots,\phi_k)\cos(\phi_{k+1})+(h^{1/2}s\sqrt{1-hs'^2}-h^{1/2}s'\sqrt{1-hs})\sin(\phi_n)\dots\sin(\phi_{k+1})\Big)$$

We split the integral into two parts,

$$I_k=\{|\phi_k-\pi/2|\le h^{1/2}|s-s'|^{1/2}: j=k+1,\dots n\}$$

and $S^n\setminus I_k$. On I_k we have

$$|\cos(\phi_{k+1})|\lesssim h^{1/2}|s-s|^{1/2}$$
$$|\sin(\phi_n)\dots\sin(\phi_{k+1})|>\frac{1}{2}$$

and since

$$|h^{1/2}s\sqrt{1-hs'^2}-h^{1/2}s'\sqrt{1-hs}|>h^{1/2}|s-s'|$$

we can integrate by parts to pick up a factor of $|s-s'|$ each time. This yields

$$\left|\int_{I_k} v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}\circ R_{s,k}\circ R^{-1}_{s',k}(x)v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}(x)\tilde{f}(x)(1+h(x^2_{k+2}+\cdots x^2_{n+1}))^{2\beta_k}d\mu(x)\right|\le(1-|s-s|)^{-2}$$
$$\times\left|\int_{I_k} v^{j\tilde{+}2}_{k-1}\circ R_{s,k}\circ R^{-1}_{s',k}(x)v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}(x)\overline{f}(x)(1+h(x^2_{k+2}+\cdots x^2_{n+1}))^{2\beta_k}d\mu(x)\right|$$

which using Cauchy-Schwartz and the inductive assumption yields

$$\left|\int_{I_k} v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}\circ R_{s,k}\circ R^{-1}_{s',k}(x)v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}(x)\tilde{f}(x)(1+h(x^2_{k+2}+\cdots x^2_{n+1})^{\beta_k}d\mu(x)\right|\le(1-|s-s|)^{-2}$$

On $S^n\setminus I_k$ we note that the inductive hypothesis gives us

$$\left|\int_{S\setminus I_k} v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}\circ R_{s,k}\circ R^{-1}_{s',k}(x)v^{\tilde{j}}_{k-1}(x)\tilde{f}(x)(1+h(x^2_{k+2}+\cdots x^2_{n+1}))^{2\beta_k}d\mu(x)\right|$$
$$\lesssim \sup_{S^n\setminus I_k}\left(\frac{1}{(1+h(x^2_{k+2}+\cdots x^2_{n+1}))^2}\right)$$

However on $S^n \setminus I_k$ we have

$$|x_{n+1}| = |\cos(\phi_n)| \geq h^{1/2}|s-s'|^{1/2}$$

so

$$\left| \int_{S \setminus I_k} \tilde{v_{k-1}^j} \circ R_{s,k} \circ R_{s',k}^{-1}(x) \tilde{v_{k-1}^j}(x) \tilde{f}(x)(1+h(x_{k+2}^2 + \cdots x_{n+1}^2))^{2\beta_k} d\mu(x) \right| \leq (1+|s-s'|)^{-2}$$

as required.

□

Having obtained our combination, ϕ_α of highest weight harmonics it only remains to prove that there is indeed a $h^{1-2\alpha} \times h^{(1-\alpha)(n-1)}$ region where ϕ_α is large enough.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose ϕ_α is given by (3) with $k = n$. Then there is a $h^{1-2\alpha} \times h^{(1-\alpha)(n-1)}$ region in which $|\phi_\alpha| > ch^{-\frac{n-1}{2}+\frac{\alpha(n-1)}{2}}$.*

Proof. We prove this by expanding u_n about the point $(\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n) = (0, \pi/2, \ldots \pi/2)$. This corresponds to the point $(1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ which is fixed by all the rotations so all terms in the sum are equal to i^j at this point. This point lies on the equator where the original harmonic is equal to

$$(ix_1 + x_2)^j = (\cos(\phi_1) + i\sin(\phi_1))^j = e^{ij\phi_1}.$$

Consider the function $e^{ij\phi_1}u_n$ at $(0, \pi/2, \ldots, \pi/2)$

$$|e^{ij\phi_1}u_n| = h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}+\frac{\alpha(n-1)}{2}}.$$

On the other hand when $|\phi_m - \pi/2| \leq \epsilon h^{1/2}, m \neq 1$ the conditions on the coefficients of Proposition 3.1 tell us that

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_1} (\cos(\phi_1) + i\sin(\phi_1))^j u_n \right| \leq jh^{2\alpha} \cdot h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}+\frac{\alpha(n-1)}{2}}$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_m} (\cos(\phi_1) + i\sin(\phi_1))^j u_n \right| \leq jh^{\alpha} \cdot h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}+\frac{\alpha(n-1}{2}} \quad m \neq 1.$$

So if we take a $h^{1-2\alpha}$ in ϕ_1 by $h^{1-\alpha}$ in the other ϕ_m region about $(0, \pi/2, \ldots, \pi/2)$ then we would still have

$$|u_n| = |e^{ij\phi_1}u_n| > h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}+\frac{\alpha(n-1)}{2}}.$$

□

4. Predicting the correct scale

In this section we discuss the heuristics of the semiclassical proof (for whole manifold and submanifold estimates). The details of the proof can be found in [7] and [11] and we will not address them here. The semiclassical approach to eigenfunction estimates is to study quasimodes, that is functions such that

$$\left\| (h^2\Delta - 1)u \right\|_{L^2(M)} \lesssim h \left\| u \right\|_{L^2(M)}$$

or more generally

$$\left\| p(x, hD)u \right\|_{L^2(M)} \lesssim h \left\| u \right\|_{L^2(M)}$$

where $p(x, hD)$ is a semiclassical pseudodifferential operator,

$$p(x, hD)u = \frac{1}{(2\pi h)^n} \int e^{\frac{i}{h}\langle x-y, \xi \rangle} p(x, \xi) u(y) d\xi dy$$

whose symbol, $p(x,\xi)$ satisfies the admissibility criteria

1) If $p(x_0,\xi_0)=0$ then $\nabla_\xi p(x_0,\xi_0)\neq 0$
2) The characteristic set $\{\xi \mid p(x_0,\xi)=0\}$ has positive definite second fundamental form.

For Laplacian eigenfunctions the semiclassical symbol $p(x,\xi)=|\xi|_g^2-1$ so clearly this is admissible. In fact in the flat case the characteristic set is the $n-1$ sphere (the canonical example of a hypersurface with positive definite second fundamental form). Quasimodes, as distinct from eigenfunctions, have the nice property that they remain quasimodes under localisation so we may work locally. It is relatively easy to show that contributions localised away from the characteristic set are small. Therefore we may work locally around some point (x_0,ξ_0) such that $p(x_0,\xi_0)=0$. To prove L^p estimates we perform the following steps

Step 1) Factorise the symbol. Since the characteristic set is non-degenerate (by admissibility condition 1) we can always find some ξ_i such that

$$|\partial_{\xi_1} p(x_0,\xi_0)|>c>0$$

so by the implicit function theorem, locally

$$p(x,\xi)=e(x,\xi)(\xi_i-a(x,\xi'))$$

where $|e(x,\xi)|>c>0$. The semiclassical calculus then tells us we may invert $e(x,hD)$ to obtain

$$(hD_{x_i}-a(x,hD_{x'}))u=hf$$

where $\|f\|_{L^2(M)}\lesssim \|u\|_{L^2(M)}$.

Step 2) By setting $x_i=t$ we find that u is an approximate solution to the semiclassical evolution equation

$$(hD_t-a(t,x',hD_{x'}))v(t,x)=0.$$

Therefore by Duhammel's principle we may write

$$u=U(t,0)u(0,x')+\int_0^t U(t-\tau,\tau)f(\tau)d\tau$$

where $U(t,\tau)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases}(hD_t-a_1(\tau+t,x',hD_{x'}))U_h(t,\tau)=0,\\ U_h(0,\tau)=\mathrm{Id},\end{cases}$$

The problem then reduces to finding (uniform in τ) $L^2\to L^p$ mapping norms of $U(t,\tau)$ or the restriction of $U(t,\tau)$ to a submanifold.

Step 3) We estimate the $L^2\to L^p$ norms through a $TT^\star$ method. The key point is to obtain estimates of the form

$$\|U(t,\tau)U(s,\tau)^\star\|_{L^1\to L^\infty}\lesssim h^{-\kappa_\infty}(h+|t-s|)^{-\gamma_\infty}$$

and

$$\|U(t,\tau)U(s,\tau)^\star\|_{L^2\to L^2}\lesssim h^{-\kappa_2}(h+|t-s|)^{-\gamma_2}.$$

All other estimate follow by interpolation with these and resolving the $t-s$ integral with either Young's inequality or Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev. It is here we see the connection with Keel-Tao [6] abstract Strichartz estimates which can be proved in the same fashion.

For submanifold estimates there is an additional question of whether this special direction, $x_i = t$, lies along the submanifold or not. It turns out we may assume that it does as this case gives all sharp estimates. That is if $\Sigma = \{(y, z) \in M \mid z = 0\}$ we may assume that ξ_i is dual to y_1.

The interpolation argument of Step 3 gives an estimate of the form

$$\|U(t)U(s)^\star\|_{L^{p'}\to L^p} \lesssim h^{-\kappa_p}(h + |t-s|)^{-\gamma_p}.$$

We can think of this as a decay estimate for propagation time $|t-s|$. To generate sharp examples we then need to find what scale of $|t-s|$ makes the largest contribution to the estimate. The sharp example will then be the T_α whose long direction is equal to this critical scale $|t-s|_c$. That is

$$|t-s| = h^{1-2\alpha}.$$

Therefore the regime changes in the L^p estimates depend only on the power γ_p the numerology of which depends only the $L^1 \to L^\infty$ estimates and the $L^2 \to L^2$ estimates. To resolve the $t-s$ integral we estimate

$$\int (h + |\tau|)^{-\frac{\gamma_p p}{2}} d\tau.$$

- If $\frac{\gamma_p p}{2} > 1$ the major contribution comes from the smallest possible τ and since we truncate at scale $|\tau| = h$ we expect T_0 to give the sharp estimate.
- If $\frac{\gamma_p p}{2} < 1$ the major contribution comes from the largest possible τ and likewise the sharp estimate should occur when $h^{1-2\alpha}$ is equal to this scale.
- If $\frac{\gamma_p p}{2} = 1$ all scales contribute equally and we need to appeal to Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev to obtain bounds in this case. For this case all possible scales should give sharp examples.

4.1. **Whole manifold numerology.** In the case we are interested in $L^2(M) \to L^p(M)$ estimates the critical point where $\frac{\gamma_p p}{2} = 1$ is when $p = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$.

- For p larger than this value the largest contribution must come from $|t-s| \approx h$ (since the truncation means we cannot see scales below that). Therefore the sharp example will be T_0.
- For $p < \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ the largest contribution comes when $|t-s|$ is big. Since we are on a compact manifold we have $|t-s| \lesssim 1$ so the sharp example will be $T_{1/2}$. This can be easily checked to be the case.
- At the point $p = \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ all the T_α are sharp.

4.2. **Hypersurface numerology.** In the case where Σ is a hypersurface and we are estimating $L^2(M) \to L^p(\Sigma)$ the critical p where $\frac{\gamma_p p}{2} = 1$ is $p = \frac{2n}{n-1}$.

- For the larger p the big contribution comes from $|t-s| \approx h$ so we get sharp examples with T_0 again.
- For the smaller p again the big contribution comes from $|t-s| \approx 1$ and the corresponding sharp example is $T_{1/2}$.
- Again at the critical point all T_α are sharp.

4.3. **Lower dimensional submanifold numerology.** For lower dimensional manifolds the critical p is always equal to or less than 2. Therefore all sharp examples come from T_0. For an $n-2$ dimensional manifold the critical p is $p = 2$ and this is what causes the log loss in our estimates.

4.4. Σ_β **numerology.** To determine where we expect sharp examples to occur for $L^2(M) \to L^p(\Sigma_\beta)$ estimates we need to determine the numerology of γ_p. Since we may prove all results by easier techniques we do not prove any estimates here, rather we appeal to heuristic arguments that tell us which T_α to choose. The $L^1 \to L^\infty$ estimates are the same independent of what subset of M we are considering so all we need to do is determine the $L^2 \to L^2$ estimates. In [11] we see that these are given by the $L^2(\Sigma_\beta) \to L^2(\Sigma_\beta)$ mapping norms of an operator

$$W(t-s)u = \int W(x,y,t-s)u(y)dy,$$

$$W(x,y,t-s) = h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}(h+|t-s|)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}} e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi(x,y,t-s)} b(t,s,x,y)$$

where the factor

$$e^{\frac{i}{h}\phi(x,y,t-s)}$$

oscillates with frequency $h^{-1}|t-s|^{-1}$. From considerations of almost orthogonality we expect that the $L^2(M) \to L^2(M)$ mapping norm of such an operator should be determined by the mapping norm on $h^{1/2}|t-s|^{1/2}$ boxes. That is

$$\|W(t-s)\|_{L^2(M)\to L^2(M)} \lesssim h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}(h+|t-s|)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}(h^{\frac{1}{2}}|t-s|^{1/2})^{n-1} = 1$$

(recall that we have set one of our original dimensions as time so x and y live in an $n-1$ dimensional space). On the submanifolds we can still perform almost orthogonality arguments in the submanifold directions so we expect

$$\|W(t-s)\|_{L^2(\Sigma)\to L^2(\Sigma)} \lesssim h^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}(h+|t-s|)^{-\frac{n-1}{2}}(h^{\frac{1}{2}}|t-s|^{1/2})^{k-1} = h^{-\frac{n-k}{2}}(h+|t-s|)^{-\frac{n-k}{2}}$$

and indeed in [11] we see that this is true. For the $L^2(M) \to L^p(\Sigma_\beta)$ we need to divide into two cases. If $h^\beta \geq h^{1/2}|t-s|^{1/2}$ we expect to be able to run the same argument as over the full manifold

$$\|W(t-s)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_\beta)\to L^2(\Sigma_\beta)} \lesssim 1, \qquad |t-s| \leq h^{2\beta-1}.$$

So for this range of $|t-s|$ the numerology will be the same as the full manifold numerology. For $|t-s| < h^{2\beta-1}$ we may still run almost orthogonality in the submanifold variables so we expect an estimate of

$$\|W(t-s)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_\beta)\to L^2(\Sigma_\beta)} \lesssim h^{-\frac{n-k}{2}+\frac{\beta(n-k)}{2}}(h+|t-s|)^{-\frac{n-k}{2}}, \quad |t-s| \geq h^{2\beta-1}.$$

So the numerology will be the same as the submanifold case. We may now put these observations together to determine the sharp examples. First we consider the region $|t-s| \leq h^{2\beta-1}$.

- When $p \geq \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ we know from the whole manifold numerology that the largest contribution comes from $|t-s| \approx h$ and the sharp examples are given by T_0.
- For $p < \frac{2(n+1)}{n-1}$ largest contribution from the whole manifold numerology comes at the largest $|t-s|$ which, in this case, is $|t-s| \approx h^{2\beta-1}$. Therefore we may expect sharp examples for T_α where $h^{2\beta-1} = h^{1-2\alpha}$, that is $\alpha = 1-\beta$ (and indeed this is what we see in Example 2.1).

Now we consider the regime where $|t-s| \geq h^{2\beta-1}$ where the numerology is given by the submanifold numerology.

- In the case that Σ is a hypersurface and $p \leq \frac{2n}{n-1}$ the largest contribution comes from the largest possible $|t-s|$, that is $|t-s| \approx 1$ so we expect $T_{1/2}$ to give sharp examples.
- Where Σ is a hypersurface and $p \geq \frac{2n}{n-1}$ the largest contribution comes from the smallest $|t-s|$ that is $|t-s| \approx h^{2\beta-1}$ so we expect sharp examples from $T_{1-\beta}$ again.
- Where Σ is lower dimensional the largest contribution always comes from the smallest $|t-s|$, that is $|t-s| \approx h^{2\beta-1}$. So again we need to look for a sharp example $T_{1-\beta}$.

References

[1] N. Burq, P. Gérard, and N. Tzvetkov. Restrictions of the Laplace-Beltrami eigenfunctions to submanifolds. *Duke Math. J.*, 138(3):445–486, 2007.

[2] N. Burq and C. Zuily. Concentration of laplace eigenfunctions and stabilization of weakly damped wave equation. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, pages 1–22, 2016.

[3] X. Chen and C. Sogge. A few endpoint geodesic restriction estimates for eigenfunctions. *Communications in Mathematical Physics 329(2)435-459*, 2014.

[4] Z. Guo, X. Han, and M. Tacy. L^p bilinear quasimode estimates. *arXiv:1503.00413*, 2015.

[5] A. Hassell and M. Tacy. Semiclassical L^p estimates of quasimodes on curved hypersurfaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 22(1):74–89, 2012.

[6] M. Keel and T. Tao. Endpoint Strichartz estimates. *Amer. J. Math.*, 120(5):955–980, 1998.

[7] H. Koch, D. Tataru, and M. Zworski. Semiclassical L^p estimates. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 8(5):885–916, 2007.

[8] K. Krupchyk. L^p concentration estimates for the laplacian eigenfunctions near submanifolds. *arXiv:1604.05769v1*, 2016.

[9] C. Sogge. Problems related to the concentration of eigenfunctions. *arxiv.org/abs/1510.07723*, 2015.

[10] C. D. Sogge. Concerning the L^p norm of spectral clusters for second-order elliptic operators on compact manifolds. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 77(1):123–138, 1988.

[11] M. Tacy. Semiclassical L^p estimates of quasimodes on submanifolds. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 35(8):1538–1562, 2010.

E-mail address: melissa.tacy@adelaide.edu.au

School of Mathematics, University of Adelaide, SA, 5005 Australia